

### **Remarks**

Claims 1, 7, 17, 19, 20, 26, 29-31, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 43-45 have been amended, and claims 18, 27, 32, 33, 37, 40, 42 and 46 have been canceled. Review and reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks below are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 11-37, 39, 40, 42 and 46 are rejected as defining obvious subject matter over U.S. Pat. No. 4,614,450 to Neiman in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,080,223 to Mitsuyama, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,345,394 to Sullivan. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 32 and 33, and claims 32 and 33 have been canceled. Accordingly, claim 1 now specifies that the storage sheet has at least two card pockets positioned thereon, wherein each card pocket is differently sized to closely received differently sized index cards therein. Claim 1 also now specifies that the supply sheet has a plurality of index cards formed therein including two differently sized index cards, wherein each index card is sized to be closely received in a corresponding one of the card pockets.

In contrast, the Sullivan reference (which is relied upon to show the supply sheet) only discloses a single size of "index card" formed therein and detachable therefrom. In particular, the inserts 42 Sullivan are sized such that their lower half (i.e. below printed line 44) corresponds to the size of a typical address label (see column 1, lines 6-29 and column 2, lines 42-51). Thus the inserts 42 are designed to be of a uniform shape.

In addition, the pockets of the Mitsuyama reference are not sized to receive differently-sized index cards, nor are the pockets sized to closely receive the inserts 42 of the Sullivan reference.

As noted in Fig. 5 of this application, a full-sized index card 55 can be secured in corresponding pocket 15, and a half-sized index card 56 can be closely received in corresponding pocket 20 (paragraph [0023]). Accordingly, it is submitted that the subject matter of amended claim 1 is not shown in the cited references.

The remaining independent claims (claims 19 and 29) have been amended in a manner analogous to claim 1. In particular, claim 19 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 37, and claim 37 has been canceled. Claim 29 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 40, and claim 40 has been canceled. Thus claims 19 and 29 are believed to be allowable for the same or similar reasons as amended claim 1 described above.

The dependent claims amended herewith have been amended to accommodate the canceled claims, accommodate the amendment to the corresponding independent claims, or to correct typographical error.

It is noted that certain claims are rejected over U.S. Pat. No. 6,652,178 to Walton in view of Sullivan, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 3,720,304 to Laugherty et al. However, that combination of references is not applied to claims 32, 33, 37 or 40, and therefore claims 1, 19 and 29 are believed to distinguish over those references..

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Application is now in a condition for allowance, and a formal notice thereof is respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required, including the fee for an extension of time, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 20-0809. The applicant(s) hereby authorizes the Commissioner under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a)(3) to treat any paper that is filed in this Application which requires an extension of time as incorporating a request for such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven J. Elleman/  
Steven J. Elleman  
Reg. No. 41,733

THOMPSON HINE LLP  
2000 Courthouse Plaza NE  
10 West Second Street  
Dayton, Ohio 45402  
(937) 443-6838